

COLLIS SCORED BY THE MAYOR.

Commissioner Asked for Asphalt Money and Was Berated.

GOT THE MONEY, TOO.

Strong, Fitch and Jeroloman Denounced the Torn-Up Condition of Streets.

\$317,000 FOR EIGHTH AVENUE.

Over Three Hundred Thousand Also Allowed to Asphalt Other Streets—Collis Promised to Be Speedy.

General Collis was put upon the rack by members of the Board of Estimate yesterday. Mayor Strong, Comptroller Fitch and President Jeroloman, of the Board of Aldermen, commented more or less severely upon the disgraceful condition of the torn-up city thoroughfares. Collis asked for \$317,000 to asphalt Eighth avenue, from Fifty-ninth street to One Hundred and Fifty-ninth street.

"It seems to me," said Mr. Fitch, "that you ought to leave the west side of the Park alone until you have finished the rippling and tearing on the East Side, on Fifth avenue. That side is impassable, certainly in my neighborhood."

General Collis denied that people were deprived of the use of Fifth avenue. "It is outrageous to have so many avenues opened," the Mayor chimed in. "This Eighth avenue rippling up ought not to be done until the Madison and Fifth avenue business has been completed."

Mr. Jeroloman wanted to know why the Board was asked for the money now. He claimed to know that although a permit for a change of motive power had been granted to the Metropolitan Street Railway Company, that corporation was not ready to proceed with the work.

A Disreputable Venice.

"The avenue is in a disgraceful state," he went on. "Whenever it rains it is like a canal."

He referred particularly to the Thirty-fourth and Forty-second street crossings. It was in bad condition from Fifty-ninth to Fourteenth street, notwithstanding the city was paying \$40,000 a year to keep it in repair. The people all along the avenue were indignant and at a mass meeting urged the Metropolitan Street Railway, by petition, to hasten the change of motive power, but were informed that it could hardly be done this year.

"I should like to have General Collis's explanation," he said.

"As soon as I get President Vreeland, of the Metropolitan Company, on the phone, I can answer part of Mr. Jeroloman's objections," said Mr. Collis. He was soon called to the telephone, and when he reappeared he said:

"Mr. Vreeland informs me the contract for changing the power on Eighth avenue has been signed, and that work will begin next Monday morning. It will be done in three sections, and I can have the asphalt completed as fast as the railroad contractors do their work."

After compelling Collis to make a detailed explanation how he intended to finish the avenue, Mr. Fitch moved that the \$317,000 be appropriated, but that the change of motive power and the paving must be conducted at the same time. This was agreed to.

More Than Thousands for Collis.

Then another asphalt appropriation was passed, under Collis's very urgent appeal that "the season was getting short." The streets and amounts are:

Forty-fifth street, First avenue to Lexington street, Central Park West	\$19,371
Seventy-fifth street, Columbus avenue to West End avenue, Sixth Avenue	17,192
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	10,795
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	20,400
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	9,124
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	12,863
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	9,700
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	4,735
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	14,223
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	17,553
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	38,912
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	38,138
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	20,393
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	10,236
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	13,808
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	3,281
Twenty-first street, Lexington street to Lexington street, Central Park West	65,822
Total	\$307,926

Shortly afterward Mayor Strong received a letter from John E. White, of Cedar street, complaining that Columbus avenue, between Fifty-ninth and Sixty-fifth streets, was being torn up to convert the cable road at that point into a road to be operated both by cable and an underground electrical system. Mr. White claimed the avenue was being torn without proper authority. When the Mayor had read the letter he said:

"I am going to send this right over to General Collis."

"I gave the company a permit to repair its tracks between Fifty-ninth and Sixty-fifth streets," Commissioner Collis said. "As soon as I learned they were using the power I stopped it. That's all I could do. I shall so inform the Mayor."

A real estate transaction involving thousands of dollars is very often the outcome of a little Real Estate "Want" in the Journal, costing 20 cents. If you have any real estate to sell or exchange, try a "Want" in the Journal.

DIDN'T KNOW BROTHERS.

Miss Harmon's Mental Condition Said to Be Critical. Jeweller Withdraws Complaint, 1230

Ex-Accused-General Harmon and his brother, Eugene Harmon, whose sister has been charged with the theft of a ring from a Maiden Lane Jeweller, arrived in this city from Cincinnati on Wednesday night, and yesterday called to see her at the home of Mrs. M. E. Schoen, a friend of the Harmon family, at No. 1142 Park avenue.

Miss Harmon, whose mental condition is described as being very critical, did not recognize her brothers. The Jeweller, who has now been made acquainted with the mental disorder of the woman, has, it is said, withdrawn his complaint, and Miss Harmon will, as soon as she is able to be moved, be taken to Cincinnati.

Were Wedded on the Sky.

Miss Marion W. Lloyd, of Freeport, N. J., and Samuel Gordon, of Madison township, were secretly married at New Brunswick Sunday afternoon last. Mrs. Gordon is popular in Freeport, where she resided with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. F. Lloyd. For some time past she had received Gordon's attentions, but none of her friends had been told of the marriage, and when, Monday morning, the young couple returned home and told of what had happened they were heartily congratulated.

The Rapid Safety Filter, 1709 Broadway, N. Y., endorsed by the Board of Health as the best filter in the world.

LETTER FROM HIS WIFE'S COVENS.

May Have Given Them to the Plaintiff Himself, Says Guy Reynolds.

LOVE LETTER IN A FRAME.

Figured in the Reynolds-Klopman Divorce Suit Yesterday and Made Startling Disclosures.

A love letter, framed and with a glass over its face, was the feature of the Reynolds-Klopman divorce hearing yesterday. The letter was of a very ardent character and apparently not intended for publication. It was passed about from hand to hand for inspection. Guy Reynolds, the defendant and heir to the Fayerweather millions, promptly acknowledged himself as the author, but was not at all successful in elucidating its meaning.

It is doubtful if any man enjoys the ordeal of hearing his love letters discussed by a lot of cynical and indifferent people, but Reynolds assumed a nonchalant air as if to say:

"Well, you all know how it is yourselves."

The referee who was not pleased with his frivolous answers sternly rebuked him, saying once:

"The trouble with you is that you are trying to make us believe something different than what you meant at that time."

One of Many.

The framed letter was one of eighty which Reynolds wrote to the pretty plaintiff, Mrs. Lillian Allen-Reynolds-Klopman, in the years 1892 and 1893. Reynolds had been allowed to look them over to see if he could find any allusion to support his contention that the plaintiff knew he had a wife and was in no doubt at any time as to the character of her relations with him. The framed letter was the only one he had found and even in that the important words which might have established his case were torn out. The words Reynolds picked out to show that he mentioned his wife were:

"I will be down three days the coming week; she is going to the city. I will be such a snip. Look out how you dress Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, for 'she' may catch on."

In both cases in the lines quoted the word "she" had been torn out. There was a long wrangle between the lawyers and some cross-examination to make Reynolds admit that the omission might have been some other word. He insisted that it was "she" and that he always referred to his wife in that way when talking to Miss Allen. There was no testimony to show how the important words were torn out.

"What did you do with the dress?" asked Benjamin Stelhardt, the plaintiff's counsel.

Sold His Wife's Dresses.

Reynolds rather hesitatingly explained that "Miss Allen," as he called Mrs. Reynolds-Klopman, had asked him whether he had belonged to his wife before she went into mourning, and it might be uncomfortable if his wife saw her wearing one.

"How did she get the dresses?" came the quick, sharp question.

The defendant rather lamely explained that he had brought a trunk to the city, and had sold them to a dealer, "Miss Allen" had afterward bought them.

In another letter Reynolds refers to various schemes for making money. Among other things he speaks of a scheme he had for making old stamps, which cost him less than five cents, and which he sold to stamp collecting enthusiasts for \$10 each. He says:

"If I can find enough loose here and find a few more, I'll be in it to a good time."

Reynolds would not admit on examination that he actually made counterfeits. He said it was one of his schemes for making money, and Lillian was always asking for money, so he had to promise her something.

Mrs. Reynolds-Klopman's attorney took up another letter, in which Reynolds remarked among other things: "I don't know how to do anything for you I could. Don't do anything rash." He went on to explain that the letter was written to her when she was in the city, and he expressed regret for having already caused her so much trouble. When asked whether he had ever seen the letter, Reynolds said: "I wanted to keep her quiet. I feared exposure."

"What exposure?"

"That people would find out I had an affair with her and had a wife at the time."

Sold by the Referee.

Reynolds attempted to get the referee Donahue to tell him of his proposal of marriage from a Spaniard, and that he was worried about this also, when he wrote the letter under consideration. Referee Donahue plainly told Reynolds he did not believe him, and sharply lectured him for his evasive way of answering.

By agreement the attorneys on both sides laid over the case for final consideration until next Monday.

The only new witness yesterday was Mrs. C. F. Marr, now of Boston, who testified for Mrs. Reynolds-Klopman.

At one time she had boarded at Mrs. Marr's house on Sixth avenue in this city; that she was known as "Miss Allen," but she never lived in the house after she was "the secret wife" of the defendant, who went under the name of Randolph.

Another hearing will be held Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock. The plaintiff's attorneys charge that Reynolds's attorneys are procrastinating. Mrs. Reynolds-Klopman has had the case delayed for a long time and it may be finished Monday. So far as the hearing yesterday was concerned, the testimony did not throw much light upon the effect of Reynolds's marriage to the plaintiff.

NO ONE TO BLAME.

Such Is the Verdict of the Coroner's Jury Touching the Tract Society Elevator Accident.

The Coroner's jury in the inquest of the Tract Society building elevator accident, in which Nicholas Nelson and Isaac Bachrach were killed, yesterday rendered a verdict that no one was to be blamed.

The effect that the accident was caused by the release of the safety guards of said elevator, after some one had pawed them.

The jury found also that no one who understood the system in use was in charge at the time, and holds no one criminally liable for the case. The verdict says: "We recommend no citation of this community that high speed elevators in use, which are open to the public, should be under the charge of a competent engineer at all times and places."

A Congressman was waylaid by two thugs and almost lost \$700. If his two known acquaintances had succeeded in getting the money, a "Want" in the Journal's Lost Found and Reward column would have brought it back very quickly.

Henry W. Sage's Will Filed.

Thames, N. Y., Sept. 23.—The will of the late Henry W. Sage has been filed and proved at the Surrogate's office. It was the case of the late philanthropist had given to Cornell University, during his lifetime all that he owned, and he was filed with the Surrogate.

Charles A. Dana passed yesterday quite comfortably at his home at West Island, L. I., and seemed slightly recovered at night. All members of the family were with him throughout the day.

WITNESSES FOR LUTGERT FELL TO CONFUSION.



Luetgert's Attorney and Four Witnesses for His Defence.

Under Cross-Examination They Failed to Make Good the Stories Told of Seeing Mrs. Luetgert on May 3 and May 4.

By Julian Hawthorne.

Chicago, Sept. 23.—Since the defence began its struggle the temperature has been rising in court, though outside the weather is delightfully cool. The proximate cause of this unwelcome change appears to be Mr. Phalen. This is, I understand, his first large case, and he attaches great importance to it. His bearing bristles and, as it were, crackles with defiance and indignation; there is a flush in his cheeks, and fire in his blue eyes.

Mr. Denen's way with a witness is very effective, but it seems to exasperate Mr. Phalen to the last degree. The State's Attorney is always good humored, and he has a trick of repeating the substance of the witness's answer in such a manner as to give it a significant twist which might otherwise escape the jury. He has a broad and imperturbable sense of humor, and a keen insight into character, and knowledge of human nature; in all which respects, as it seems to me, he has a marked advantage over counsel for the defence.

The witness never knows what the next question is to be, and it comes so quick that he has no time to invent answers, and is apt if he is trying to conceal anything, to blurt out the wrong thing before he knows it.

Mr. Denen also has the advantage of a thorough familiarity with his own case, and apparently of his opponent's, too; whereas the defence is continually stopping to confer with counsel, and to make suggestions from one another; they even seem sometimes not to know the names of their own witnesses.

In fact, I may say that the defence's case produces upon me the impression of being seriously mismanaged. It has not been adequately prepared, and the counsel are continually overstepping the bounds of correct legal procedure. It is, of course, an unusually difficult case to prepare, not only in itself, but by reason of the character of most of its witnesses.

There has been a good impression, and none of them so far have materially aided Luetgert's case.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very curious one. It is that the State has no such case as to the fact that the State may not find it necessary to prove that Rose is mistaken in denying this, but I understand that it has the means of doing so.

The position of the State as regards this effort of the defence to counteract the testimony of Emma Schimpke and her sister, Gottlieb, that they saw Luetgert and his wife enter the factory at 10:30 on the night of the first of May, is a very